AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes amendments to Figure 2.

Attachment: Replacement sheet

CG/CMV/ta

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 15 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, and rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham (USP 6,704,024) in view of Arai (USP 6,456,286). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the Interview conducted on July 31, 2008. During the Interview, Applicant's representative reiterated arguments that *Kashiwagi* failed to teach or suggest, as recited in claim 1, complexity calculating means as recited in the claims. As the previous Examiner had changed his grounds of rejection of unamended claims, the finality of the prior Official Action was improper. The new Examiner agreed to withdraw finality and issue a new, non-final Official Action after further search and consideration.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings asserting they fail to show the decision descriptions in Fig. 2, i.e., which branch is for when complexity < upper limit and complexity > upper limit as described in the specification on page 7, lines 21-28.

Applicant maintains that Fig. 2, and the description thereof, adequately describe which branch is for when complexity < upper limit and complexity > upper limit. However, in order to

CG/CMV/ta

satisfy the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended Fig. 2 to clarify branch 204. In addition, Applicant has amended the specification to conform to amended Fig. 2.

Based on the amendments made herein, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Robotham (USP 6,704,024) in view of Arai (USP 6,455,286).

The Examiner's Rejection of Claim 1 is Improper

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Robotham discloses all of the claim elements, except the calculating complexity means. The Examiner relies on the teachings of Arai to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Robotham. The Examiner asserts that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the teachings of Robotham with the teachings of Arai in order to automatically determine the best viewing and rendering mode of the client device, thereby saving the rendering cost.

The disclosure of Robotham is directed to a visual content browsing system using rasterized representations. Robotham discloses visual content is rendered on a server system, transformed into bitmaps compatible with the display attributes of a client device and transmitted for display on the client device.

At col. 63, lines 5-15, Robotham discloses as follows:

> In one embodiment yielding improved user responsiveness, a correspondence map is separated into multiple segments based on defined sections of the mapped content and/or multiple resolution levels. By segmenting into multiple resolution levels, a lower resolution map is created and is then augmented by segments that provide additional resolution levels. Segmenting can be accomplished so that a smaller map is first transmitted and made available for use by the client 24. Subsequent segments of the map can be transmitted later, or not transmitted at all, based on the relative priority of each segment using factors such as current or historical usage patterns, client requests and/or user preferences.

As can be seen from the above disclosure, Robotham discloses providing a lower resolution map and then augmenting the map by segments providing additional resolution levels. These additional resolution levels may or may not be transmitted based on relative priority of each segment.

Additionally, at col. 67, lines 7-31, Robotham discloses as follows:

In another embodiment, viewing the dynamically selected region of interest with two or more rendering techniques can also be supported. For example, a news article with photographs or illustrations can be viewed both with a raster extraction of the detail to see the detailed overall layout with the text and images and with a text-related content extraction to more easily read the text portions of the article. Such an example is shown in FIGS. 14A-14E.

An overview representation 122 of a Web page is shown in FIG. 14A. Based on user selection, a bounding box over a region of interest is displayed in FIG. 14B. In this example, both a "graphics" (raster extraction) and a "text" (text-related rendering of a source extraction) mode may be available. The "G" in the upper right hand corner of FIG. 14B indicates graphics mode. The requested detail representation of the selected region of interest is shown in FIG. 14C. This detail representation is placed within a client viewport 16, and the user can either pan or scroll to see the remainder of the selected region. The user can also switch to "text" mode, as shown in FIG. 14D, with the upper right hand indicator changing from "G" to "T." The resulting text-related display of the selected region is shown in FIG. 14E, with the user able to scroll up and down the word-wrapped rendered text.

As can be seen from the above disclosure, Robotham discloses a text mode and a graphics mode.

The Examiner relies on the teachings of Arai to teach the complexity calculating means of claim 1.

The disclosure of Arai is directed to an apparatus and method for displaying three dimensional polygons based on the detected rendering capability of the display equipment. At col. 8, lines 30-62 discloses as follows:

In FIG. 3, numeral 10 denotes a polygon rendering capability detecting part, numeral 20 denotes a visual quality determining part, numeral 30 denotes an optimum polygon number calculating part, numeral 40 denotes a polygon number adjusting part, numeral 50 denotes a polygon data storing part, numeral 60 denotes a displaying part, and numeral 70 denotes a controlling part.

CG/CMV/ta

The polygon rendering capability detecting part 10 of Embodiment 1 detects the rendering capability defined by the hardware processing capability of the equipment used by the user. In Embodiment 1, the polygon rendering capability detecting part 10 includes a rendering capability setting part 11 with which the user further can adjust the rendering capability. The polygon rendering capability detecting part 10 detects the polygon rendering capability of the equipment used by the user based on the processing capability of the CPU used by the equipment, the presence or absence of a graphic accelerator and the capability thereof and the like, and **detects the number of polygons N.sub.ap that can be processed**. The rendering setting part 11 is an input part to which the user inputs information for designating reproduction conditions. For example, the user can input instructions to change the number of polygons N.sub.ap that can be processed or to **upgrade or degrade the picture quality**. In the case where an instruction to upgrade or degrade the picture quality is input, for example, a coefficient .alpha. is assigned to the total number of polygons N.sub.ap that can be processed, and .alpha. is increased or decreased. For example, .alpha. can be decreased by 10% to each information input that instructs further degradation of the picture quality, which results in a .alpha.=0.9 and the number of polygons after adjustment can be assigned as 0.9 N.sub.ap. Herein, N.sub.ap is the same N.sub.ap as used in Equation 8. (emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above disclosure, Arai discloses merely adjusting the number of polygons to be processed based on the system capability resulting in an upgrade or degrade of picture quality.

1.   **The cited art fails to teach to teach or suggest "control means for suppressing display of at least one of the objects included in said content based on said calculated complexity, said priorities, and an upper limit of processing capability of the apparatus," as required by amended claim 1.**

In support of the Examiner's rejection, the Examiner asserts that Robotham discloses this claim element by teaching that the user may select a region of interest via a bounding box (Fig. 14B). The user can be in graphics mode ("G") which comprising both graphics and text (Fig. 14C). The user can also switch to "text" mode ("T") resulting in display of only the text (Fig. 14E), thereby teaching "suppressing display. The Examiner further cites to col. 67, lines 10-30.

The Examiner appears to be confusing two different embodiments of Robotham. One embodiment of Robotham provides a lower resolution map and then augmenting the map by segments providing additional resolution levels based on priority of each segment based on usage patterns, client requests or user preferences.

CG/CMV/ta

The alternative embodiment relied upon by the Examiner provides for two viewing modes as selected by the user.

First, Applicant maintains that the Examiner's reliance on two separate embodiments of Robotham, without setting forth a proper 35 U.S.C. §103 analysis is improper.

Second, Applicant maintains that the two viewing modes of Robotham is insufficient to teach control means for suppressing display of part of the objects included in said content **based on said calculated complexity, said priorities, and an upper limit of processing capability of the apparatus**. Robotham clearly discloses displaying only text when a user selects the text mode. Thus, the suppression of the graphics is not based on the priority and the upper limit of processing capabilities of the apparatus.

For at least these reasons, Applicant maintains that the Examiner's rejection is deficient as Robotham fails to teach or suggest this claim element.

2.   The combination of the cited art fails to teach to teach or suggest "control means for suppressing display of at least one of the objects included in said content based on said calculated complexity, said priorities, and an upper limit of processing capability of the apparatus," as required by claim 1.

The Examiner seeks to combine the teachings of Arai with the teachings of Robotham. As noted above, Arai discloses adjusting the number of polygons to be processed based on the system capability resulting in an upgrade or degrade of picture quality.

Applicant maintains that the modified system of Robotham would merely result in a system that provides for displaying all of the content in either a lower resolution or a higher resolution based on the capabilities of the system. In other words, the modified system would still fail to teach or suggest control means for **suppressing display of at least one of the objects** included in said content **based on said calculated complexity**, said priorities, and an upper limit of processing capability of the apparatus.

As such, the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 is deficient as the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements.

CG/CMV/ta

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 17 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based on their dependency on claim 1.

Applicant further submits that claims 6 and 11 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

The Examiner's Rejection of Claim 3 is Improper

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 3, the Examiner merely refers to her rejection of claim 1. However, claim 3 recites a different element of "control means for invalidating part of the functions for displaying said objects." The Examiner has failed to properly consider this claim element.

There is no disclosure in either of the references that teach or suggest this claim element in combination with the other elements.

Further, as the Examiner has failed to properly consider this claim, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner set forth a proper *prima facie* rejection in a new, non-final Official Action.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 3 at least based on its dependency on claim 3.

Applicant further submits that claims 8 and 13 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 3 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 3.

The Examiner's Rejection of Claim 5 is Improper

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 5, the Examiner, in referring to her rejection of claim 2, asserts that Arai discloses reducing or adjusting the number of polygons in a frame and therefore teaches control means for suppressing a frame.

CG/CMV/ta

However, as noted above, Arai discloses adjusting the number of polygons in a frame. The frame is displayed but the image quality is adjusted based on the processing abilities of the display system.

These teachings are insufficient to teach or suggest suppressing a frame. As such, the cited references, either alone or in combination, are insufficient to teach or suggest all of the claim elements.

Applicant further submits that claims 10 ands 15 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 5 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 5.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

CG/CMV/ta

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Replacement Sheet of Figure 2
                Annotated Sheet of Figure 2

CG/CMV/ta